

REMARKS

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 3-11 to more clearly define and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants consider to be the present invention. Basis for the amendments can be found in original specification and original Claim 3, which has been cancelled by the present amendment. Additionally, the redundant term in Claim 10 has been deleted.

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Entry is believed to be proper and respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendments, Claims 1-21 are pending. No additional claims fee is believed due.

REJECTIONS

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102 over Perry et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 10, 12, 13 and 16-20 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Perry et al. (US 6,368,359). The Examiner states that Perry et al. teaches a process that contacts an article with decamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent, removes the solvent, contacts the solvent with salt solutions, then separates and dries the solvent, and finally reuses the solvent. The Examiner asserts that said process meets all the material limitations of the present claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants point out that the process of the presently claimed invention includes the sequential steps of, first, forming an emulsion comprising water and a lipophilic fluid, followed by pretreating the emulsion; recovering the lipophilic fluid from the emulsion; and purifying the lipophilic fluid. In contrast, Perry et al. discloses a first step of mixing the silicone solvent with the aqueous solution to purify the silicone solvent; and additional treatments applied to the mixture include separating the silicone solvent from water and optionally, drying (Col. 4, lines 31-35 and Col. 2, lines 28-32). Applicants submit that the mixture in the first step may be an emulsion, or a merely physical mixture sustained by agitation (Col. 2, lines 28-32 and Col. 4, lines 31-35). Thus, Perry et al. discloses formation of an emulsion or a mixture concurrent with purification of the silicone solvent. Perry et al. does not disclose a first step of forming an emulsion and a subsequent step of pretreating it. Therefore, Applicants submit that Perry et al. does not anticipate the presently claimed invention because Perry et al. does not disclose every claim limitation of the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102 over Brendt et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-18, 20 and 21 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Brendt et al. (US 6,063,135). The Examiner states that Brendt et al. teaches a process of contacting an article with a composition comprising decamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent. During the cleaning

process, the composition is continuously recycled by removing the solvent and passing it through a filter containing carbon or diatomaceous earth. After cleaning, the solvent is removed by centrifugation and heating; the resulting vapor is condensed for reuse and the used solvent is purified by vacuum distillation. The Examiner asserts that said process meets all the material limitations of the present claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants point out that Brendt et al. merely discloses removing a mixture comprising silicone solvent from the article being cleaned by centrifugation and heating, then purifying the used solvent by vacuum distillation (Col. 8, lines 41-45 and lines 54-57; and Col. 9, lines 21-24). Thus, the vacuum distillation step serves to separate the solvent from the mixture. Brendt et al. does not disclose a step of recovering the lipophilic solvent from the emulsion prior to the purification of the solvent. Therefore, Applicants submit that Brendt et al. does not disclose every claim limitation of claims 1-18 and 20. Further, with respect to claim 21, Brendt et al. does not disclose collecting and/or condensing lipophilic fluid vapor and combining it with the emulsion. Therefore, Applicants submit that Brendt et al. does not anticipate the presently claimed invention embodied in claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the above represents a complete response to the Office Action and overcomes all the rejections. Withdrawal of rejections and issuance of a notice of allowability are respectfully requested.

April 22, 2003
Customer No. 27752

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline Wei Berk

Caroline Wei-Berk
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,203
(513) 627-0352

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

GROUP 1700